Left Caucus newsletter

Published by the Steering Committee
of the
ONDP Left Caucus
Station G., Box 92
1075 Queen St. E.
Toronto M4M 1H0

August, 1985
Vol. 1, No. 1

THREE MAJOR VICTORIES BY LEFT AT NDP CONVENTION

It went largely unreported by the media, but the party's left wing won three major victories at the federal convention in Ottawa on the July 1 weekend.

-- The NDP's out-of-NATO policy was overwhelmingly reaffirmed when it was forced onto the floor on the second day of the convention.

-- The Federal Council's key economic policy document was rejected for its failure to include any mention of the public sector. It was subsequently amended and passed in accordance with a Left Caucus referral motion.

-- A leadership-backed technological change resolution was rejected for its failure to mention the reduced work week as a central means of preventing layoffs. It was also amended in accordance with a Left Caucus referral motion.

It was, in the opinion of one sympathetic MP, the Left Caucus' best showing since its formation at the 1979 convention, and it buoyed the spirits of the several dozen delegates who regularly attended its meetings. About 130 delegates were present for the Caucus' major planning meeting on the first day of the convention.

The left victories could be attributed to several factors:

1. The leadership's subtle efforts to shift policy to the right, reflected in its thinly-veiled campaign against the NATO policy, and the conspicuous absence of traditional planks like social ownership and the reduced work week from key domestic policy resolutions.

2. The greater ability of the Left Caucus to identify and respond to this rightward drift in a united way. In recent conventions, the Caucus appeared to lack the will and confidence to fight major questions on the floor

3. The presence of many new delegates, particularly from Quebec, who joined the party in the wake of its "ordinary people" campaign last year. They joined the party because they were told it is fundamentally different than the old-line parties, and they expect these differences to be clearly reflected in policy.

4. The greater independence of the labour bloc. The confidence of labour delegates, by and large, still resides with the leadership and they continue to view the left with skepticism. But the leadership's drift to the right has led labour to oppose it on matters like NATO, the reduced work week, and free trade.

In another development of interest to left supporters, Simon Rosenblum was defeated in his bid to retain his Federal Council seat. He was knocked off the official slate in a move led by Northern Ontario delegates.

ANTI-NATO POLICY REAFFIRMED

The party's anti-NATO position was reaffirmed by 85% of the delegates when it was debated on the second evening of the convention.

Burnaby MP Svend Robinson later told a Left Caucus meeting that he would introduce a private member's bill in the House calling on Canada to withdraw from NATO and NORAD.

The issue was not supposed to come to the floor. None of the 30 resolutions on NATO was given any priority by the resolutions committee. Virtually all were anti-NATO.

The issue was only brought forward when angry delegates from ridings in the West and the Maritimes insisted it be debated. They had come a long way, they said, and it was mostly to reaffirm the anti-NATO policy.

Party leaders had publicly made known their disatisfaction with the current policy, and were seeking to change it at this convention. But these plans were abandoned in the face of a

widespread outcry by riding associations and other organizations like the BC provincial council, Metro Toronto labour council, and the UAW.

Spadina MP Dan Heap, who led the fight to defend the policy, condemned NATO on the convention floor as "an aggressive nuclear alliance" that was the "chief threat" to the emerging nations of the Third World.

Left Caucus speaker David Tomczak told delegates that Canada's NATO membership underlay its testing of the cruise missile, higher defence expenditures, and support for the escalating arms race.

Simon Rosenblum, the main organizer of the "into NATO" wing, argued that the party's anti-NATO stance made it difficult to get Canadians to accept the party's views on disarmament.

But party leader Ed Broadbent conceded later to reporters that the public shares the NDP's position on Star Wars and other disarmament questions independent of the party's policy on NATO.

ECONOMIC POLICY REJECTED FOR IGNORING SOCIAL OWNERSHIP

The leadership's key economic resolution was rejected by convention delegates on the third day of the convention.

The resolution was based on the report of the recent NDP Action Group on Jobs led by MP's Steven Langdon and Lorne Nystrom.

The resolution called on domestic and foreign companies to create jobs in exchange for tax breaks, grants, and subsidies. It was silent on the role of the public sector in job-creation.

A referral by Simon Rosenblum which had the prior support of Langdon and other party leaders, called for the resolution to be further developed by the party's policy review committee. It made only passing reference to public ownership.

In opposing both the resolution and the referral, Left Caucus speaker Marv Gandall said it was the first time a party economic resolution "did not even pay lip-service to the notion of public ownership."

"It leaves the lip-service to the referral", he said.

The Rosenblum referral was defeated and a stronger Left Caucus referral by Hilda Thomas of Vancouver emphasizing the role of social ownership and the public sector was subsequently passed by the delegates.

Party leader Ed Broadbent later told reporters that mention of the public sector had been omitted "inadvertently".

TECH CHANGE RESOLUTION AMENDED TO INCLUDE REDUCED WORK WEEK

A resolution on technological change was amended on a referral by the Left Caucus to include reference to the shorter work week.

The resolution, introduced by MP Michael Cassidy, was silent on the subject.

Wally Majesky, secretary-treasurer of the Ontario Federation of Labour, spoke in favour of the referral as did several UAW and other labour delegates.

The reduced work week is a cornerstone of the labour movement's efforts to preserve jobs.

The amended version of the resolution also deleted a reference to job-sharing.

CENSURE MOTION BLOCKED

The party leadership used its control of the resolutions committee to block a motion censuring the Manitoba NDP government for closing the Morgentaler abortion clinic in Winnipeg.

The censure resolution was given a low priority, as was another resolution reaffirming the party's policy on choice; ensuring that the issue was never discussed by convention.

The Women's Committee, after heated debate, decided not to challenge the low priority given to the matter. Some women feared if the challenge were defeated, it would be interpreted as a setback for the pro-choice movement.

A petition calling on Manitoba Premier HowardPawley to drop the charges against Dr. Morgentaler, signed by 400 delegates, was sent instead.

Public Forum

● NATO: Its Meaning for the Peace Movement

FRIDAY, March 29 - 8:00 pm

MEDICAL SCIENCES BLDG.
AUDITORIUM
King's College Road, U of T Campus

CO-CHAIRPERSONS: **Mary Rowles:** Chairperson ONDP Women's Committee (1983 - 85)
David Tomczak: Chairperson of NDP Metropolitan Toronto Area Council (1981 - 85)

PANEL:

Dan Heap	**Bob Penner**	**Angela Browning**	**George Ehring**
Spadina NDP MP	Toronto Disarmament Network	Against Cruise Testing	Left Caucus of Ontario New Democrats

CONTRIBUTION — UNEMPLOYED FREE

Ontario N.D.P. Left Caucus Conference

SATURDAY, March 30
9:30 am - 4:30 pm

Toronto Board of Education
155 College Street

● Organizing to Strengthen the "Out of NATO" Policy

- ☐ NATO AND THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE
- ☐ U.S. SETS NATO PATTERN IN CENTRAL AMERICA
- ☐ NATO AND AN INDEPENDENT FOREIGN POLICY FOR CANADA

ORGANIZING TO DEFEAT THE LEADERSHIP'S DUMPING OF OUR "OUT OF NATO" POLICY
DEFENDING THE N.D.P. AS THE ANTI-WAR PARTY

REGISTRATION FEE: $10.00

● **Social Evening** SATURDAY, March 30 - 8:30 pm FALLOUT SHELTER, 370 Queen Street East

For further information: ONDP Left Caucus c/o David Tomczak 375 Montrose Ave., Toronto M6G 3H2 (416) 536-6561

ONDP LEFT CAUCUS NEWSLETTER 1985

Issue #2

NDP UPDATE

A Publication of the ONDP LEFT

We hope to make this column a regular feature of all Left Caucus Newsletters in order to keep party activists up to date on what is going in the party. Your contributions and suggestions for worthwhile material will be greatly appreciated.

* * *

The recent coverage of the last NDP Federal Convention in local NDP newspapers was an interesting exercise in how the party leadership communicates with its members. In Ontario, the ONTARIO DEMOCRAT (they aren't even willing to be New anymore) didn't even mention the federal convention let alone cover the political debates at all. This publication has been steadily declining over the last year and definitely needs both new blood and some real political discussion to enliven its moribund pages.

In B.C.,where the party seems to pay at least some lip service to the idea of keeping its members informed on party discussions and issues its coverage was a fascinating exercise in news management. No mention whatsoever was given to the economic debate at the convention in spite of the fact that it was the keynote resolution to be dealt with and that the final referral that won (which the Left Caucus put forward) was made by Hilda thomas a prominent B.C. New Democrat. - The NATO resolution, also fought for hard by B.C. activists was given a minor paragraph announcing it had been reaffirmed and ignoring the overwhelming vote in favour of re-affirming it as well as the lively debate that accompanied it.

No discussion was given to the Abortion debate in the Women's Caucus nor to the petition circulated and almost universally signed by NDP members expressing their dissatisfaction with the Pauley government's lack of progress on this key issue. (NDP Update has been told that future issue of the BC New Democrat will deal with this so we will wait and see.)

How has your local publication dealt with the convention or other intra-party issues. Let us know at NDP UPDATE when you get a chance.

* * *

The Seperate School Funding issue remains one of the major issues both within the province of Ontario and within the ONDP. Recently an organization called New Democrats to Preserve Public Education was formed to help organize New Democrats who oppose our provincial party's support for the current Liberal and previous Conservative government's intent to extend full public financing of the Seperate (Catholic) School Board in Ontario to senior high school grades.

The ONDP Left Caucus has seen this local issue become a watershed issue for many party activists who oppose it. The issue goes much deeper than a simple extension of funding and deals squarely with the issues of what the responsibilities of secular socialist party should be when dealing with educational issues. At a time when cutbacks in public education have been the norm in the Province of Ontario massive funding is suddenly going to be shifted away from the secular public school system into the Catholic Seperate School system. Can voucher education be far behind?

These are among the questions and issues that will be discussed at an upcoming ONDP Left Caucus forum on the Seperate School Funding Issue at Bloor Collegiate High school Auditorium on Nov. 22nd at 7:30 pm. Speakers include OSSTF Past President Malcolm Buchanan and former NDP Provincial Candidate Diane Meeghan who ran on a platform opposed to the extension of Seperate School Funding.

FUNDRAISING UPDATE

We would like to thank those Left Caucus members who responded generously to our fundraising appeal in our first newsletter. Currently we have raised enough money to retire our previous debt and provide us with enough funds to produce 2-3 issues of the Left Caucus Newsletter. This amounts to over $400 so far from more than 50 supporters.

We would also like to thank those of you who took the time to fill in the member information card and return it to us. We received over 70 and some respondants mentioned that they were unemployed and.or unable to provide us with a contribution at this time, but would like to continue to receive the Newsletter and other Left Caucus mailings. We will be happy to continue to send the mailings to these members and will endeavour to continue sending mailings to others on our mailing list as well.

ONDP LEFT CAUCUS NEWSLETTER

But we would like to hear from you! Our mailing list in its entirety amounts to over 500 people and we need contributions from more than just 10% if we are to continue a regular schedule of publications and mailings. In this newsletter will be another cut-out card. For those who haven't either sent word of the current situation or a contribution please take the time to fill out this card and send it back with a contribution.

CORRESPONDANCE FROM THE LAST NEWSLETTER

A few of you expressed some concern about filling in our membership information card without knowing more about who the personalities were in the Left Caucus executive. We apologize for the oversight. We should have included a list of current executive members and their ridings. They include:

Lois Bedard (High Park/Swansea)
Angela Codina (Parkdale)
Marv Gandall (Ottawa Centre)
Fred Gloger (Ottawa Centre)
Bob Kasher (Broadview/Greenwood)
Harry Kopyto (Parkdale)
Christopher Ross (High Park/Swansea)
Mary Rowles (Broadview/Greenwood)
David Tomczak (Trinity)
Tina Zink (London Centre)
George Ehring (Eglinton)

There was also some concern about our request for whether Left Caucus members were Executive Members of their Riding Associations or not. We did not mean, in the request, to denigrate the efforts or activist commitment of those Left Caucus members who weren't part of an executive. We simply wished to know, for the simple reason that in many ridings party activism on a regular basis is conducted solely by the Executive, which also has access to and control of a riding associations' newsletter or other sources of communication. If a member of a riding association where there was a Left Caucus executive member, existed we wanted to be able to put them in touch with each other. We definitely want to encompass as wide a variety of party activists on the Left as possible and certainly did not mean for our enquiry to be seen as implying a preference for Riding Executive members.

NAME: _____
ADDRESS: _____
CITY/PROVINCE: _____
(AREA CODE) PHONE #(H) _____
(W) _____
POSTAL CODE _____
RIDING (FED.) _____
RIDING (PROV.) _____
UNION (LOCAL) _____
OTHER POLITICAL GROUPS _____

ONDP LEFT CAUCUS EDUCATIONAL:

NOV. 22
7:30 PM
BLOOR COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE AUDITORIUM
1141 BLOOR ST. W.
(Corner of Bloor St. W./Dufferin St.)

ONDP LEFT CAUCUS CONFERENCE:

NOV. 23
REGISTRATION BEGINS AT 9:00 AM
BOARD OF EDUCATION CAFETERIA- 7TH FLOOR
155 COLLEGE ST.
(Corner of College St./McCaul St.

Distributed as a Petition at the June/85 ONDP Provincial Council Meeting.

For 25 years, the ONDP has stood proud as the party of working people and their allies. This vision of an NDP polity and its prospect as a basis for a government has won the allegience of than one in four voters in past elections. The idea of a government which would take on the old-line parties and their policies of subservience to the U.S.-dominated Canadian elite has clearly won significant approval. Unfortunately the dying weeks of the May 2nd election saw our leadership abandon this idea in favour of a soft sell, low profile campaign. With the electorate seeking an alternative to almost half a century of Tory rule, the Liberal Party, which moved out aggressively to meet this mood, filled the void left by the NDP and thus became the primary recipient of a strong protest vote.

As a result, our party was faced with the unattractive prospect of providing support for a Liberal government in order to oust the Tories and properly carry out the popular will of the Ontario electorate for a change in government. We realize and agree with the necessity of ousting the Tories from power by voting to support a Liberal non-confidence motion. We are not opposed to entering into agreements with other parties around specific issues we want passed. But the path of entering into a 2-year long agreement with the Liberal Party as part of a long term perspective of further minority governments as well as the prospect of further consideration for accomodation and coalition with the Liberals is a path fraught with danger for our party

The identity of our party as a distinct and consistent opponent of the Liberals has been put into question by our lacklustre campaign, our virtually indistinguishable platform and our public reluctance to face up to a possible snap election. In the process, the idea of an NDP government, which could return control of our economic and natural resources to its rightful owners, which could provide a distinct, progressive and socialist vision for the people of Ontario has been put on a back shelf, along with the idea that the NDP can form the government of Ontario, as though these ideas can simply be brought forth again at a more propitious time without any harm. In the process we compromise our greatest asset, our distinguishability as a party of clear alternatives and vision apart from the old-line political forces we oppose.

We realize that these issues and others are not simple ones, nor are they issues that have occurred only as a result of the recent dramatic events alone. On the contrary, those events themselves have resulted from the long term erosion of our party's identity as a clear alternative of principled difference from the other political parties that has occurred over a long period of time. As members of the ONDP, we feel that this direction undertaken by our leadership raises fundamental questions requiring discussion at <u>all</u> levels of the party. We call on the Provincial Council to initiate an ongoing discussion so that full input and consultation can be had from the membership. Without such a discussion and hopefully a change in direction in the party, we feel that an election after two years of supporting a Liberal minority government could be disastrous.

NAME ADDRESS PHONE #

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

If you are really a socialist

(or a democratic socialist, or even a social democrat)...

...how can you believe that private, sectarian secondary schools should be supported by public taxes?

Many New Democrats believe that you can't.

But isn't that the NDP's official policy?

Yes; the Ontario NDP has officially supported full funding for separate schools since 1970. Now a Liberal Government, with NDP support, has introduced legislation—Bill 30—and has started to implement it without waiting for it to become law.

Our question is, **should full funding be the policy of our Party?** We want all New Democrats and others with a social conscience to think about this, carefully and with an open mind. How does this policy, which our Party shares with the other two in the Legislature, fit in with our socialist ideals?

In this leaflet, we explain why we believe that Bill 30 should be stopped. You will see that for the purposes of discussion we have adopted an imaginary heckler who poses (in italics) some questions that have in fact been asked. We hope you will agree with our answers.

First, who are you?

We are all Ontario New Democrats in good standing. Outside the NDP, we go under the name of *Socialists to Preserve Public Education (SPPE)*. Within the Party, we are known as *New Democrats to Preserve Public Education (NDPPE)*.

We believe that the Ontario Government's current initiative is educationally misguided, fiscally unsound, socially divisive, morally repugnant and logistically senseless. We deeply regret that our Party supports it. Our aim is to change Party policy. The Government must be stopped in its tracks.

Don't the Catholics have a Constitutional guarantee of full funding?

That's for the courts to decide. At least we should wait to hear what the Supreme Court of Canada rules before we set up a whole new secondary school system for just one religious denomination. Distinguished legal counsel have said that Bill 30 violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms by discriminating *in favour of* Roman Catholics and therefore *against* all others. Some also hold that separate schools have no constitutional guarantee of funding beyond Grade 8. That's what Canadian courts and the British Privy Council ruled in the precedent-setting Tiny Township case in 1928.

But surely Bill 30 honours a historic moral obligation to the Roman Catholics?

We don't see it that way. More than a century ago, Protestant and Roman Catholic political leaders made a deal to maintain respective school systems. We believe that the *letter* of that agreement, reached in the rural, bipartisan Ontario of our great-great-[great-...]grandparents, should have no force in the multicultural, largely urban community of today. Its *spirit*, however, is binding. It should guarantee fairness for the Hindus, Jews, Muslims, Baptists and even atheists who were not represented in those ancient negotiations, but who now make Ontario such a rich and varied society.

Does that mean separate schools for all?

Now that really *is* against Party policy. It also defies common sense. The 1981 Census, in classifying Canadians by religious affiliation, collected information about 34 distinct groups in Ontario—of which the fourth largest was those with no religious affiliation at all. Most secondary school districts would end up with more school boards than schools. What we want instead is equal opportunity for all, *in a single public school system*.

But don't parents have the fundamental right to educate their children as they see fit?

We'll grant that for argument's sake, but it isn't wholly true. Our laws justly restrict the rights of parents over their children. If you don't agree, try beating your child, or failing to feed her properly, or keeping her home from school, or denying her a blood transfusion. All of those things have been done in Ontario from professed motives of religious or social conscience, and all of them have been forbidden by the courts.

So it isn't axiomatic that you have the right to do anything that infringes on a child's rights. And since she will have to live in a pluralistic society, we think she has the right not to be confined to schools in which everyone shares one set of beliefs. But, even granting parents the right to choose a sectarian education for their children, *why should the rest of us have to pay for it?*

But you don't have to pay for it. If I'm a Catholic, I support it through my school taxes.

Not entirely. That's where school systems get some of their money, of course; but some comes from the Provincial Government's general tax revenues, to which we all contribute. Also, schools in both systems are exempt from property taxes, and every ratepayer thus contributes to the support of every school, whether Catholic or public.

Still, I pay my share. Why shouldn't I decide where it gets spent?

Aha, the voucher system rears its ugly head. Well, why do we have a publicly funded school system at all? What's in it for society?

We believe that public schools exist for two main reasons. They help to shape future society in the light of the shared legacy and distinctive traditions of all our communities; and they try to send everyone out into that society with a more or less equal chance of success. We believe that these ends can be met only by a single public school system. We are not arguing that other schools should not exist; but we do claim that those who use them are opting out of the public system and should not expect the general public to pay for their choice.

All right, let's change the tax structure so that each school system is funded entirely by the members of the community using it.

That's inconceivable for New Democrats who have sweated blood and ink trying to abolish all regressive taxes, especially those for specific purposes, such as OHIP premiums. A prime example is property taxes, from which most school funds come.

To the NDP, the steady reduction in the Province's share of education costs has been one of the worst of the many and spectacular sins of the late Tory government,. Surely we don't want to do an about-face now?

Moreover, in a time of declining enrolment and budgetary restraint, any duplication of educational services is fiscally unsound. Either we pay more taxes or we get less for them—or both. We could have one really good school system. Do we need two systems? Can we afford two systems?

Don't both systems serve the same goals?

Definitely not. The very existence of two systems, as well as wasting money, is socially divisive. Denominational schools are elitist because they have the right to restrict entry; in fact, the myth that they give a better education has led some non-Catholics to choose separate schools. Does this pluralistic and tolerant society want one religious group to have special status and privilege?

Whatever the final form of Bill 30, if it is passed we will have a *separate, Catholic* system. The schools in that system will teach Catholic dogma. Have you recently examined Catholic dogma, for instance as it relates to women or to organized labour?

Both in action and in doctrine, the Catholic Church has a long history of opposition to women's rights. Catholic women must be subordinate in the Church and in the home. They must take rulings on their social and sexual conduct from a hierarchy of professionally celibate males. In countries where the Catholic Church is powerful, countless women die every year from the strain of excessive childbirth because the Church forbids them to use birth control. Even abstinence is suspect, partly because it frustrates the established conjugal rights of the male.

The Church's record on organized labour is no better. Despite the heroism of individual dissident priests, the official Church has failed the workers in Latin America and elsewhere who have looked to it for help, and has in fact disciplined the dissident individuals. One specific case is closer to home and to our present concerns. Teachers in some Catholic schools in Ontario recently struck for smaller class sizes and thus for better education. The Church's recation was to have its parish priests act as strike-breakers.

These attitudes are part of the educational heritage passed on to Catholic children. It should not be educational policy in this province to propagate such doctrines. The public purse of Ontario should not support them.

Isn't that anti-Catholic? Where's your tolerance?.

We do advocate tolerance; but of people and their individual consciences, not of doctrine dogmatically implanted. In religious belief, as in any other area, individual freedom is constrained to respect the freedom of others; my right to swing my fist stops where your nose starts. We don't care about—or rather, while caring, we have no right or desire to suppress—the honest beliefs of any Ontario citizens. We concede that they may have the right to pass on those beliefs to their children. We maintain, however, that that should be done at home or in church, not in school—and especially not at public expense. Under Bill 30, Roman Catholicism would be the only religion supported by public money. That comes close to making it the state religion of Ontario. We believe that Church and State must remain separate.

In other words, none of us is against Catholics. All of us are against using publicly-funded schools to implant Catholicism, *or any other religious doctrines (including our own).*

And you think this important enough to reverse a long-standing Party policy?

Yes, indeed. We can't understand how a socialist Party ever came to support the extension in the first place. There are no intellectually respectable arguments in favour of it. As a Party, we should just admit that we were wrong, and start being right.

This issue is fundamental to the socialist ideals of the NDP, and not just in theory. If Bill 30 becomes law, we are at risk of losing some of the support that has enabled us to fight, and sometimes win, such crucial battles as medicare, environmental protection, rent control, and equal rights for all Ontarians. To carry our viewpoint, we in the NDP must have a majority of the people on our side. Consider the importance of a compassionate, liberal education in getting us that support. Ask yourself whether sectarian schools make that compassion and tolerance more or less likely. Then tell us whether the NDP will stand a greater or lesser chance of having any of its social ideals politically accepted in the future.

If you're so concerned with political acceptability, what about this issue itself? You're throwing away votes.

We think that's quite false. It seems clear that the people of Ontario don't want this extension, and that there are countless votes out there for the first party to realise it. Let that not be the Tories. It would be cruelly ironic if they were returned to another 40 years of power by being the first party to reverse itself on this issue.

What about the Catholic vote?

What about it indeed? How many Roman Catholic families send their children to separate schools now? Fewer than two-thirds. How many of those are uncommitted? (As many feminist and gay activist candidates have found the hard way, women and homosexuals are usually too smart to be single-issue voters; and so are most Catholics.) How many ridings have a lot of these floating Catholic votes in them? How many of those have a sitting member that is easily defeated? In how many of those are we not in third place?

And how many New Democrats want to belong to a Party that is prepared to sell its principles for a few seats in the Legislature?

So what can I do to help you oppose the public funding of sectarian schools?

We thought you'd never ask. It's simple.

(1) If you aren't already a New Democrat, sign up. Check the box below that says *I want to join the NDP.* We'll send you a membership application form.
(2) In any case, fill out the rest of the form and send it to us.
(3) Phone or write to your NDP MPP or candidate (or to an NDP MPP from a nearby riding) and tell him or her what you think.
(4) Make sure that your riding association discusses Bill 30 at an early general meeting, and asks for the issue to be on the agenda at the next Convention.
(5) Write to the *Ontario Democrat* and to your riding association's newsletter.

☐ I want to join the NDP.

☐ I am already a New Democrat.

Name _____

Address _____

_____

_____

Postal Code _____

Telephone: Home _____

Work _____

Provincial Riding _____

Please return to:
163 Carlton Road, Unionville, ON L3R 3L7

We welcome contributions, made payable to SPPE or NDPPE